DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 524 EA 005 115

TITLE	Pilot Universal Lunch Program. Hearing Before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session on H.R. 13452.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	37p.; Bill To Provide for a Program of Demonstration Projects To Test and Evaluate the Effectiveness, Nutritional Benefits, Administrative Procedures and Potential Costs of a Universal Food Service and Nutrition Education Program for Children
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Costs; Economically Disadvantaged; *Federal Aid; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; *Lunch Programs; *Nutrition

ABSTRACT

This report contains hearings held to determine the advisability of passage of legislation setting up universal lunch program demonstration projects. It contains statements by food service association representatives, a superintendent of schools, and by Congressional Representatives. (JF)

APR 30 1973

PILOT UNIVERSAL LUNCH PROGRAM

ED 078524

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 13452

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A PROGRAM OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO TEST AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS, NUTRITIONAL BENEFITS, ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, AND POTENTIAL COSTS OF A UNIVERSAL FOOD SERVICE AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 20, 1972

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 005 115

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

86-020 WASHINGTON : 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
LOUISE DAY HICKS, Massachusetts
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
VICTOR V. VEYSEY, California
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
CLIFFARD D. CARLSON, Illinois

CONTENTS

Text of H.R. 13452 1

Statement of—

Ball, Mrs. Virginia H., director of school food service, Independent School District 625, St. Paul, Minn. 13

Martin, Josephine, legislative chairman, American School Food Service Association 25

Martin, Josephine, and Lawrence Bartlett, American School Food Service 2

Neily, Adelaide, Fairfax County, Virginia Public Schools 31

Taylor, Bryan P., superintendent of schools, San Diego Independent School District, San Diego, Tex. 29

Vanik, Hon. Charles A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 19

Letters:

Bartlett, Lawrence, chairman, State directors section, American School Food Service Association, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 11, 1972, enclosing data on participation and plate waste in the school food service program 12

Eddy, Regina M., legislative council representative, department of school nurses, NEA, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 20, 1972 33

Manchester, Katharine E., president, the American Dietetic Association, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 4, 1972 33

Vanik, Hon. Charles A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio:

Letter from C. E. Bevins, director, division of school lunch, Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky., dated Jan. 6, 1972 24

Letter from Barbara Bode, vice president, the Children's Foundation, dated March 6, 1972 21

Letter from Charles L. Matthew, director, school lunch section, Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn., dated Jan. 7, 1972 24

PILOT UNIVERSAL LUNCH PROGRAM

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1972

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Green, Quie, Ruth, and Veysey.

Staff members present: Marian Wyman, special assistant to the chairman, and Charles W. Radcliffe, minority counsel for education.

(Text of H.R. 13452 follows:)

[H.R. 13452, 92d Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To provide for a program of demonstration projects to test and evaluate the effectiveness, nutritional benefits, administrative procedures, and potential costs of a universal food service and nutrition education program for children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN UNIVERSAL FOOD SERVICE AND NUTRITIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Secretary), in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is directed to formulate and administer cooperatively with State educational agencies a program of grants for demonstration projects designed to provide universal food service and nutrition education programs.

"(b) Demonstration projects supported under this section shall—

"(1) be designed to provide each child in attendance an equal opportunity to participate on the same basis as all other children with no discrimination as to time and place of serving or types or amounts of food offered;

"(2) be conducted on a nonprofit basis under the supervision of the governing authorities of participating schools; and

"(3) provide at least one meal a day without charge to all children in attendance; such meals shall consist of a combination of foods meeting a minimum of one-third of the child's minimal daily nutritional requirements. Additional meals and/or supplemental food services may be offered to all children in attendance at varying times of the day based on nutritional needs.

Projects supported under this section shall be distributed to the greatest extent possible thoughout the Nation and carried out in both urban and rural areas. In supporting projects under this section, the Secretary shall seek to achieve a distribution which allows for support of projects (1) in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, including kindergartens or child care centers where they are operated as part of the school system; (2) in low, middle, and high income areas; (3) which allow for evaluating varying methods of food preparation, delivery service, including central and satellite kitchens or commercially supplied food service; (4) in districtwide programs as well as in pilot operations and individual school attendance units; and (5) in school districts with varying ethnic and racial enrollments.

"(c) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Commissioner, shall formulate the basic elements of a nutrition education program for children to be extended through State educational agencies to schools selected for participation as demonstration projects.

"(d) The Secretary shall utilize the services of the National Advisory Council established under section 14 of Public Law 91-248, for the purpose of evaluating the results of the program of the program authorized by this section. The Secretary is authorized to appoint such special or technical advisory committees as he may deem necessary to assist in this evaluation. He shall secure the advice, assistance and recommendations of such other persons and organizations as he in his discretion deems necessary in making such evaluations.

"(e) For the purpose of making grants under this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974. Sums appropriated may be used to finance (1) direct Federal expenses; (2) State administration expenses; and (3) the cost of preparing and serving meals in pilot schools including the costs of equipment and services related thereto but not the cost of land or construction of buildings."

Chairman PERKINS. Let me first welcome all of you here.

We have a quorum present; Mrs. Green is here.

We are opening hearings this morning on a bill to provide for a program of demonstration projects to test and evaluate the effectiveness, nutritional benefits, administrative procedures, and potential costs of universal food service and nutrition education program for children.

I am delighted to welcome you here, Miss Martin, and you may proceed at this time.

STATEMENTS OF JOSEPHINE MARTIN, OF ATLANTA, GA., LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, AND LAWRENCE BARTLETT, OF NASHVILLE, TENN., CHAIRMAN, STATE DIRECTORS OF SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE, AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Miss MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, we would like for Mr. Bartlett to lead off.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, my name is Lawrence Bartlett. I am the director of School Food Services for the Tennessee Department of Education. My appearance before this committee today, however, is primarily in the role of chairman of the State directors section of the American School Food Service Association. In presenting this testimony I am speaking for our 49,000 members and the 25 million children in school who are participating in the national school lunch program.

I am speaking also for our executive director, Dr. John N. Perryman, who has testified before this committee on many previous occasions.

This will be the first opportunity that I have had to appear before this particular committee, but I have testified before other committees, both in the House and the Senate.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak in response to H.R. 13452, a bill to provide for a program of demonstration projects to test and evaluate the effectiveness, nutritional benefits, administrative procedures, and potential costs of a universal food service and nutrition education program for children.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind you of the strong, deep-seated, grassroots support that the American School Food Service Association has developed and nurtured for your universal bill which was introduced in the first session of the 92d Congress as H.R. 5291, a bill to

establish a universal food service and nutrition education program for children. You have our pledge of support for the concepts expressed in that bill.

It is my privilege to represent Dr. Perryman and act as chairman of this panel which consists of Josephine Martin, State director, School Food Services, Georgia; Virginia Ball, School Food Services, St. Paul, Minn.; and our consultant and ASFSA Washington representative, Mr. Sam Vanneman.

Section 19 of H.R. 5291 provides for pilot programs to test and develop the most effective techniques and procedures for effectuating the provisions of the act and for the purpose of developing appropriate estimates of participation and costs.

If that bill should be passed by the Congress and signed into law after July 1, 1972, it could be fiscal year 1974, the 1973–74 school year, before any pilot programs could be initiated.

With the intensification of the complexities of regulations and the necessity for adherence to these regulations in present school food service programs, we can't afford the luxury of waiting for possibly 2 to 3 years to begin pilot programs.

Our association urges that pilot programs be initiated by the beginning of the next school year to test out concepts that we believe are right for all children, but which must be demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of the Congress that they are right.

May I revert momentarily to my regular role as State director of School Food Services for Tennessee and relay to this committee some of the very significant results of a pilot program jointly initiated in the fall of 1970 by the city schools of Memphis and our State.

This initial study involved six schools in a highly concentrated low-income area consisting of four elementary and two secondary schools. The average daily attendance in these six schools for the 1970–71 school year was 8,539. The average daily meals served in March 1971 was 8,285.

Here are the savings that were effectuated in these schools as reported by the director of food services in Memphis:

Cost of lunch tickets, cards, or books	$17,000
Labor cost per plate (savings) of $0.0306	44,366
Total savings	61,366

Another savings that most people might not consider significant, but we did, and that is the matter of break-ins and vandalism.

In the six-school project during 1969–70 school year, there were reported a minimum of 38 break-ins in the schools, in which replacement costs or damages amounted to $2,876.

During the full year of the pilot program there were only 12 break-ins with an estimated replacement cost of only $1,038.

The net reports of this were 26 break-ins less, and a total savings of $1,838.

It is estimated that managers of food services in Memphis schools that did not participate in this particular project spend a minimum of 15 percent of their time in handling lunch tickets, lunch cards, or lunch books. If this time were directed to the more needed activity of program supervision or management, the total program would have benefited. The time now spent doing these chores of handling the lunch tickets, and so forth, is costing approximately $45,000.

I must now assume my original role, that of representing our association. Some of the most serious indictments that we hear against a universal program is the amount of the cost involved. In my very candid opinion there can be many offsetting savings that can and will help to reduce the cost so that the per child expenditure could be considerably less than it is now costing the parent, the Federal, State, and local governments.

It is because of the many and compounding complexities of the program that we need a series of pilot programs initiated under controlled conditions to determine not only the costs, but also the savings, that can be effectuated.

The proposals outlined in H.R. 13452 should give us many of the answers. Therefore, we again pledge the support of our association to secure passage of this bill as well as for the passage of the universal bill, and, Mr. Chairman, to assure you that some pilot program situations can be found, we are volunteering the entire State of Tennessee or any part of it for pilot program testing.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. The opposition to this bill apparently stems from the proposition that youngsters who are able to pay for their meals should pay, and we should not provide those youngsters with free meals. In other words, we have to separate the ones that are able to pay from all those who are not. That is more or less the theory of the present school lunch program.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is right.

Chairman PERKINS. What is your answer to this opposition?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, in my candid opinion, the parents who are now paying for their children's lunch daily are, also, in reality, paying for the free lunch children because they are paying both Federal and State taxes for support of this program.

So, in effect, if we feed the same number of children or increase this number of children, the people who are currently paying for the program are in reality already paying for it.

So we can eliminate a lot of the cost by making it without direct cost to the individual child, and eliminate the problem of trying to apply an economic means test, getting many people perhaps who may cheat a little bit on this, and in our opinion we would come up with a total cost per plate of less than it is now costing for the same number of children, if it was made free to every child in the school.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Do you think we should use that same philosophy under other programs? Since so many people are under AFDC, do you think every such family in AFDC should be funded the same way?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not quite as familiar with other programs as I am with the educational aspects. Primarily in our school programs we talk of a free public education program, and this is one of the very few segments of a public free education program that requires daily contributions by those who participate. We do not ask the child how much money his family earns when we provide a bus to take him to school or if he enrolls in an English class, so my feeling is if we accept the philosophy that we have a free public education, then this is a very valid part of it, and it should be made available to every child without checking to see if he can financially afford it.

Mr. QUIE. How many meals should we provide free to everybody? We are providing breakfast in some places. Is it sufficient with breakfast and the noon meal, or should we extend school a little longer so they can get the evening meal, too?

Mr. BARTLETT. At this point we have not gone into the evening program. We are a strong advocate of the breakfast program as a component to the lunch program. Now I don't have before me the total number of meals that are served. Perhaps our consultant can give us a figure on that if we need that specifically, sir.

In my State we are feeding over 100 million meals per year in the lunch program.

Mr. QUIE. I gather you would like to have free breakfasts and lunches, at least, for everyone?

Mr. BARTLETT. Right.

Mr. QUIE. And you are leaving the door open for the evening meal if we want to get to that?

Mr. BARTLETT. We would not want to close it completely tight.

Mr. QUIE. You could put some cots in there and the children would never have to go home then.

That is all.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green?

Mrs. GREEN. I did not hear an answer to Congressman Quie. Would you serve everybody a free breakfast?

Mr. BARTLETT. In the present concept those children who are now eligible for a free lunch under proposed regulations next year would be eligible for a free breakfast also. My thinking is that since the breakfast program is a fairly small program, personally I would have no objection to a free breakfast to every child because many children do come to school without breakfast, and we think this would be a marvelous way of starting the day for the child.

Mrs. GREEN. How much of the school personnel would be involved in operating the breakfast and lunch programs and therefore would not be able to perform those tasks for which they are professionally trained, as teachers?

Would you hire outsiders to take care of the food programs?

Mr. BARTLETT. Under this new concept we would want to relieve the teacher of this responsibility. I think if we make a program available, including breakfast and lunch to every child, then we have eliminated a lot of the so-called redtape procedures involved in trying to identify children for eligibility under present income level standards.

Mrs. GREEN. You may or may not have reduced the redtape, but you have increased tremendously the amount of work required if you provide meals for every child.

What about health? If a youngster needs glasses or some other item, we provide it on the basis of that need. But under your theory would we provide comprehensive free health service, glasses and dental work for every child in school?

Mr. BARTLETT. The present concept, the low income child is being provided for.

Mrs. GREEN. You are either not hearing the questions or are evading them. As I understand the situation, youngsters now receive a free lunch on the basis of need, and you recommend that everyone be given a free lunch whether he needs it or not. We now give free

glasses on the basis of need. In accord with your philosophy, would we make health services available or make glasses or dental work available to everybody regardless of their need, because you have defined such services as an integral part of the education program?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mrs. Green, if this is necessary to assure that child of getting the best that is available to him—and not waste the taxpayers' money because he is unable to learn—if this was the only way that that child could get these benefits, I think it should be provided.

Mrs. GREEN. But what if the child's parents can provide these things? Do we provide such services anyhow because it is part of the free public school system?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not sure I could answer that.

Mrs. GREEN. But you do recommend free lunches even though the parents could supply the lunch for the child? You still recommend that we assume the full responsibility and supply free lunches for everybody?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Why wouldn't you provide health services which seems more basic?

Mr. BARTLETT. I could not speak for the association I represent, but for myself I would say that this perhaps should be done.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Veysey.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bartlett, I find it hard to resist the idea that we ought to explore an interesting area such as this, but I have information which indicates that there are a number of communities now presenting free lunch programs. Is this true?

Mr. BARTLETT. To my knowledge there are only a few situations in which a complete lunch program is provided without direct costs, and these are in selected test situations. As I indicated in my testimony here, we do have a pilot program in operation on this basis in Memphis.

Mr. VEYSEY. Isn't that exactly what these programs—the half dozen or so that I am aware of—isn't that what they are intended to explore, the same objectives that you have in this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. The objectives in the present proposal would include the nutrition education which is not being provided under out present program.

Mr. VEYSEY. That would then be the only additional element?

Mr. BARTLETT. That would be an additional concept.

Mr. VEYSEY. And the rest would be duplicative of the other pilot projects now going forward?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think there are more items in this than just the nutrition.

Mr. VEYSEY. Can you point them out to me, please?

Mr. BARTLETT. The teacher, the training of the workers primarily. The big concern that we would have here is development of a nutrition education program and the training of workers, means of administration, simplification of administration of the program.

Mr. VEYSEY. I grant you there is a simplification element if you say everybody comes in on a free basis. I think that is a simplification. But what is the situation in these existing programs? Are you aware of the program, for example, in Memphis, Tenn.? I understand there is

a pilot going there; also in Seattle, Wash., in Hoboken, N.J., in Bridgeport, Conn.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am aware primarily of the one in Memphis, and our concern here is that making lunches available to the children without direct cost eliminates the problem of identification of these——

Mr. VEYSEY. Isn't that what these existing community programs are doing, the ones that I have enumerated?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not familiar with what the others are doing.

Mr. VEYSEY. It occurs to me, Mr. Bartlett, if you are proposing or advocating here an expenditure of 85 million a year to establish additional pilots to find out much the same things that are now being explored and studied in half a dozen locations in the Nation, I think we should come together here some way and build on the experience that has already been funded and the lessons that have already been learned in these other locations.

I would like to commend to you checking on the experience thus far with these other pilots before we go in yet another pilot project on top of that. That would be one observation.

Secondly, the whole objective of this bill, as I understand it, is to find out some things, find out how people respond, what the cost would be, what the cost of alternative delivery systems would be and what the benefits would be.

But I fail to find in this bill any requirements that that sort of information comes out of it. In other words, there is no evaluation requirement in the bill. It just sets up the pilots without any real strong evaluation of performance against goals that we would like to achieve.

I think this is a serious defect, and how could we say we are going to try to find out these things without that being in the legislation?

Mr. BARTLETT. Perhaps that might be somewhat difficult to do. I was not earlier familiar with the bill to recognize that this evaluation procedure had actually been left out of it.

Mr. VEYSEY. I don't find it there. The chairman and the other members of the committee know I have been advocating strong evaluation sections in much of the educational legislation going through this committee. I would not want to see us put out a pilot project without the mechanism in it to assure us of finding information on these questions.

Mr. QUIE. Could you tell me what the cost per meal in Memphis is under your new free program as compared to the cost per meal for providing food when there were some of the students paying for it?

Mr. BARTLETT. The current cost is approximately 46 cents per plate.

Mr. QUIE. Does that take care of everything, the labor?

Mr. BARTLETT. That includes the reported cost that the school itself has, administrative cost, warehousing, administrative, labor, food purchases, nonfood, all of these items that go to make up the present cost of operating the program.

Mr. QUIE. What about the cost of the kitchen and the equipment that went into it?

Mr. BARTLETT. This is not included. These programs are operated in existing kitchens that were long established and this cost has not been included or reported in this operating cost.

Mr. QUIE. What was the cost before you went into that free program?

Mr. BARTLETT. Last year's cost—of course, they have a system-wide, about 146 schools involved—the cost per plate in this study that they did last year was approximately 3 cents per plate less than the average cost for the rest of the schools in the system.

Mr. QUIE. Why was it costing them less? I see you have a labor-saving figure here, a little over 3 cents per plate.

Mr. BARTLETT. This labor savings was due—when you calculate on a per plate cost you take all of the plates, all the lunches served during the month or during the year, and you still have the same amount probably of labor involved. If you have a constant level of children eating daily, then you adjust your labor, your food purchases, and the amount of food you prepare for the day to agree with the number of children that you are serving, so that then you do not have these ups and downs, and highs and lows, as far as participation is concerned. When you have low participation for the day, you probably have the same amount of labor involved. You may have prepared the same amount of food as you would if you had a high participation. So the level of participation in the Memphis city schools has been fairly constant, so they know exactly how much to prepare for the day.

They have also eliminated labor in not having to fool with collection procedures in these schools. These are some of the reasons for the cost savings.

Mr. QUIE. You have an average daily attendance of 8,539 and average daily meals served, 8,285. What was the average daily meals served prior to the program?

Mr. BARTLETT. The system average was about 70 percent whereas our statewide average in the State of Tennessee is in excess of that.

Mr. QUIE. Are you comparing then in your own evaluation the experience in those six schools with this district average or with the State average? Shouldn't you take those same schools and compare what the experience was with them before and the experience afterward?

Mr. BARTLETT. We can get that comparison. I don't have it right at my hand right at this moment.

Mr. QUIE. Can you send that up to us, because I think that would be valuable in trying ourselves to determine that.

Also, what has happened with the throw-away food since you went to free meals as compared to when some of the kids were paying for it?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is considerably less.

Mr. QUIE. I mean thrown away by the kids.

Mr. BARTLETT. I visited a number of those schools, and I saw very little food thrown away.

Mr. QUIE. I assume there is a lot of food thrown away when they pay for it, and I can't imagine changing to a program where because it was free that would cause them to eat it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The food is very acceptable. It is well prepared. I was in one of the schools less than 3 weeks ago, and there was practically no food waste.

Mr. QUIE. Is it better prepared and is there a better choice of menu now than there was before you provided a free program?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would not say it was any big change in the quality of food. I just could not say there would be any change.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to have those figures of the amount that was thrown away by kids when they were paying for part of it and the amount that is being thrown away now when it is free, and compare it, because my belief is that if you pay for something you utilize it better than if you are given it free.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would say the food waste in these schools is very minimum.

Mr. QUIE. But you can get that information for us, the amount that was thrown away before and the amount thrown away now.

The other question I would have is if we go to free programs, do you think we ought to permit people to come in with vending machines and choices other than what is provided in the school kitchen so they could compete with the school and also have a chance to meet the diet desires of the kids? In the case of schools in some parts of the cities where it is impossible for them to build a kitchen, perhaps a private operator with a vending operation could come in there more reasonably.

Mr. BARTLETT. Basically I am opposed to the outside people coming in and trying to do a job that can be done effectively by our own staff within our own facilities.

I would admit, sir, that perhaps in some of the programs in the major cities that ethnic likes and dislikes come into this, and there might be some difficulty on a planned systemwide menu where you might have difficulties meeting all of those needs or likes or dislikes. But, basically, I believe that the school food service people themselves can do the job as effectively and perhaps more effectively than can the profit-motivated outside groups, given the same job.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think there ought to be competition so they can prove they could do it more efficiently?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to competition. If we are doing an ineffective job, somebody should see what they can do to improve it.

Mr. QUIE. My feeling is that the Department of Agriculture frowns on anybody coming in and giving competition. They try to throw out roadblocks in the way.

Mr. BARTLETT. For some 20 years this was in the regulations which you are familiar with.

Mr. QUIE. What about the percentage of the cost of the meals that the Federal Government ought to pay for? What percent do you desire?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sorry, I did not hear that.

Mr. QUIE. In providing free lunches now I assume that the Federal Government would not have to pay 100 percent of the cost because they do not have to pay 100 percent of the cost of education. The Federal Government pays 7 percent of the amount of secondary and elementary education cost. Would this be sufficient for the food program, just like education, or should we move it to a higher figure?

Mr. BARTLETT. We should move it to a higher figure.

Mr. QUIE. What level do you think we should move it to?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would think initially, of course—we are talking now primarily of a pilot program—we would assume this would be a completely federally funded program for a pilot program. But for a universal bill, certainly initially I would say we need to move to

approximately 90-percent level at the Federal Government and then have acceleration or reducing of this at later stages.

Mr. QUIE. Earlier you were talking about providing food service as something comparable to providing education. The local schools are willing to provide education for the children even if the government did not put up anything, but they must not care about the food program if the Federal Government has to pay 90 percent to induce them to do it.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have to go back to the recognition that a free public education program has been here much, much longer than the concept of a lunch program as a part of it. I think it is a matter of needing to educate our educators that food is essential to a good education program.

Mr. QUIE. On the other side they might be right. What if we are to provide $2 billion for this program to make it universal? Do you think it would be better spent to spend $2 billion on feeding children whose parents can afford to feed them or to improve the quality of education?

Mr. BARTLETT. I don't think we can divorce the needs for a good nutrition, good food program, from the concept that a child needs this in order to learn. I don't believe you can spend it much more effectively in the other realms of education than you could if you spent it for food.

Miss MARTIN. May I add to that? I think that one of the reasons we feel that universal school food service and nutrition education is so important—and we are referring to it as universal and not free because we would like to get it away from the concept of free, welfare, in this area—but universal because all children need nutrition and nutrition education regardless of the child's socioeconomic level, his cultural pattern or what else, he needs nutrition, one-third of his daily food needs as a minimum at school each day.

The reason he needs this is for two purposes. No. 1, he needs it to fulfill his nutritional needs for physical and mental development. Secondly, if we are spending the billions of dollars on education that we are spending, we want to get the maximum benefits from the educational program, and if the child is hungry, it makes no difference why he is hungry, whether it is because he does not have the money, whether he spends his money for something else, or whether he has poor food habits, we still cannot have him take full advantage of an educational program unless he is well nourished or adequately nourished.

Mr. QUIE. I have a comment, but I will yield to Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't think there is any disagreement on that question. But what is at issue here is if the parents are able to supply good nutritious meals, then why should the Federal Government or State or local government step in and say, "Even though you can feed your children properly, we will do it anyway"?

Miss MARTIN. Mrs. Green, I think we could always look back 20 or 25 years; if we had started a nutrition education program in 1946 when the National School Lunch Act was begun, then we would have been teaching young people to make wise food choices and those young people that would have already learned how to make wise food choices back then would be the parents of today.

But, unfortunately, people do not spend their money wisely. Oftentimes when they have to cut down on family expenses, the first place they cut is food, because they have an overhead.

Mrs. GREEN. Then, what you are saying is that all of the parents who can afford to supply lunches and other meals for their children do not have enough brains to supply nutritious meals. Is that what you are saying?

Miss MARTIN. No.

Mrs. GREEN. But that is the only realistic interpretation of your comments. You said we must educate in the area of nutrition. I am talking about families that have just as much sense as the people planning school lunches and who have supplied their children through the years with nutritious, well-balanced meals. My question is: Why should the Government step in and say, "Even though you are doing this, we will do it."

Miss MARTIN. I refer to the 1965 household food consumption report made by the Department of Agriculture. This study indicated that fewer American families were well fed in 1965 than in 1955.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't see that citing such a report has anything to do with my question. I am talking about the families that can afford to supply nutritious meals and are doing so. Why should the Government then step in and say, "We will do it"?

Miss MARTIN. Because many of the families who can afford to do it do not. They have not recognized the importance of nutrition to their child.

Mrs. GREEN. Again, you did not respond to my question. I am referring to families that do know about nutrition, and know as much as you or anyone else. I am talking about those families that can afford to supply nutritious meals, and do so. Why should the Government step in and say, "We will supply the meals for your youngsters and we will pay for it"?

Miss MARTIN. I really do not have an answer to that question, but but maybe we could look at it from another point of view, and that is from the standpoint of our goal of trying to help improve the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children.

The curriculum experts tell us that one of the places that where we need to work with disadvantaged children is in building his self-image and oftentimes the poor child will not accept lunch at school because it is a free lunch and the children who are better off than he is financially do not get the lunch free.

Mrs. GREEN. Now, apparently you are offering another reason for supplying everyone with meals. Do you have any statistics that bear up what you just said: that the selective serving of meals to those in need destroys the self-image of the poor child, and that the disadvantaged child won't accept the free lunch because others are not getting these meals? Are there any statistics to substantiate your assertion?

Miss MARTIN. To my knowledge, there are no specific statistics. You hear school principals and school superintendents say this. I don't know how you could arrive at a statistical report to indicate this.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you for coming here today. One comment, though. I guess I would agree to the Federal Government providing the same share for food services as they provide for the rest of education and, to

the extent we could convince the Federal Government to increase its degree of elementary and secondary school revenues, I would agree they ought to increase their assistance for food programs so it would come out the same percentage, but I think that it is necessary for you to convince parents and school board members and teachers, and not just the Members of Congress, on the need for free food.

I know there are many motivations. I served on the Agriculture Committee for awhile, and I know the motivation there of providing free food service for people. It is not just to help the nutrition of the people.

I also know there is a temptation to think of one's own aspect of education, meaning the food service, and thinking that is the most important of all. But I think we have a long ways to go in providing an adequate education as yet, and healthy functioning illiterates are not going to be much help to the Nation.

(The following letter was received from Mr. Bartlett:)

AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., May 11, 1972.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a delayed answer to at least two questions which were asked by members of the Committee on Education and Labor when I presented testimony in favor of H.R. 13452, a Bill to provide for a program of demonstration projects to test and evaluate the effectiveness, nutritional benefits, administrative procedures, and potential costs of a universal food service and nutrition education program for children.

As I recall the two questions were as follows:

(1) What is the difference in participation rate in the "all free" schools in the pilot study in Memphis before and after the charge for lunches was eliminated?

(2) What is the difference in plate waste in the Six-School Project before and after?

On the enclosures I am providing answers to these two questions. It is requested that this be included as a part of my testimony at this hearing.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE BARTLETT,
Chairman, State Directors Section.

(1) Difference between participation rate in the "all free" schools in the pilot study in Memphis before and after:

School	Fiscal year 1969–70			Fiscal year 1970–71		
	ADA	ADP	Percent participation	ADA	ADP	Percent participation
Georgia Avenue	1,736	1,578	90.8	1,779	1,729	97.1
La Rose	1,451	1,124	77.4	1,348	1,324	98.2
Leath	713	644	90.3	596	581	97.4
Locke	997	882	88.4	888	874	98.4
Porter	2,013	1,554	77.1	2,166	2,152	99.4
B. T. Washington [1]				1,762	1,755	96.6
Total	6,910	5,782	83.6	8,539	8,415	98.5

[1] Did not participate in NSLP during 1969–70.

(2) Plate waste before and after: The Area Supervisor with the Tennessee Department of Education who is responsible for supervising the School Food Service Program in Memphis and who has observed these schools very closely is of the opinion that plate waste (that which is discarded by the student) in these six schools is very much less than many of the other schools that she supervises. She also is of the opinion that it certainly is no greater now than it was before the

"all free" program was started. The Food Service Director in Memphis has also indicated to me that he feels the plate waste is no more now than before the "all free" program began.

My own personal observation in visiting in one of these schools not more than two weeks before presenting my testimony was that plate waste was very nominal.

The total plate cost (food-labor-other) in these six schools for April 1971 is tabulated and shown in the following table:

School	Plate cost	
	April 1971	February 1972[1]
Georgia Avenue	0.355	0.397
La Rose	.356	.399
Leath	.374	.485
Locke	.429	.476
Porter	.395	.453
B. T. Washington	.459	.448
Unweighted average	.395	.443
System average (for all schools in system)	.473	.502

[1] Latest month that complete data was available at the State office.

Chairman PERKINS. Our next witness is Mrs. Virginia Ball, from St. Paul, Minn., public schools.

I want to hear your comments in connection with the pilot program for universal school feeding.

We are only talking about lunch, not the breakfast program.

STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA H. BALL, DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE, INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mrs. BALL. It is a privilege for me to represent the major city directors and the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625, St. Paul, Minn., before your committee today.

By way of background, the board of education and the school administration mandated in 1967 food service for all children in St. Paul as rapidly as it could be accomplished. Secondary schools and three elementary schools serving handicapped children had been in the school lunch program for many years. Fifty-nine elementary programs were opened between September 1967, and September 1971. All of the 49,837 children in the St. Paul public schools have a hot, well-balanced, nutritious lunch available today.

We have 92 lunch programs and this includes satelliting the school lunch to four parochial schools, 31 breakfast programs, and four pilot programs for feeding the elderly in operation now. There are 35 kitchens which provide the lunch for their school and 57 satellite schools. We have an average daily participation of 28,000 students or approximately 62 percent of the enrollment. As of March 9, we are providing free and reduced price lunches to 11,626 students or 24.2 percent of the student body.

We wholeheartedly support the concept of a universal food service and nutrition education program. We feel it is essential and urgent that pilot programs be instituted in both large and small city, urban, and rural districts on a districtwide basis. Problems in each of these areas are often unrelated and feasibility studies are needed to find

solutions that would insure acceptance of universal feeding by all school districts.

After 2 years of operation under Public Law 91-248, which was certainly the greatest thing that has happened to food service since its inception, directors are finding, in spite of all of their precautions, that it is virtually impossible to protect the anonymity of the nonpaying child. Administrators at National and State levels have not been able to tell us how to comply successfully with this regulation.

Families whose income places them in a bracket just outside of the eligibility standards for free or reduced price lunches cannot receive assistance and at the same time cannot afford in this inflated era to pay for their children's lunch. This forces them to carry bag lunches which in many cases do not meet accepted nutrition standards. It seems to us that the "forgotten child" is the one who does not qualify for free and can't really afford to pay. Universal food service would permit us to feed all of the elements of society without discrimination.

There is a direct relationship between the price of school lunch and participation. Last year, in St. Paul, we had 26 schools in low income areas on totally reduced rates. The maximum charge was 20 cents per lunch. Regulations were changed this year and we were not permitted to continue this operation. Our records show that we are feeding 14.2 percent fewer children in these schools now that the price of the lunch has returned to 30 cents for elementary students and 35 cents for secondary.

Another area of concern for us is the nonpaying children who sell or barter their tickets for things like cigarettes and money. Off the record, the going price for a pack of cigarettes in one of our junior high schools is three free lunch tickets. We recognize the children who do this are in the minority, but we have no way of preventing these situations.

We find that the administration of the guidelines as outlined by the Department of Agriculture in providing policy statements for parents, applications for free and reduced lunch, eligibility standards, acceptance or rejection notices to parents, tickets, and so forth, to be very costly.

We, in St. Paul, listed only those items to which we could readily attach a dollar value and found that this year we have spent more than $26,000. We could have provided children with 47,780 lunches based upon our last year's cost figure for the same amount of money. This does not include intangibles such as sorting paid, free, and reduced tickets; making reports; selling tickets in our schools, and so forth.

We believe that implementation of universal food service into a city system is not impossible. In St. Paul, we would need to provide approximately 18,000 more lunches per day. We do not intend to minimize such an undertaking but we do believe that with careful planning, some additional equipment and personnel, we could accomplish this from our existing kitchens. We believe that every person in food service would put forth that extra effort if our goal of feeding every child was attainable.

We recognize that the clerical and statistical reporting required in a pilot universal food service program would be extensive but would hope that once the problems were resolved and criteria established this aspect of the operation could be simplified. It seems to many of us today that we spend more of our time keeping records

than we do concentrating our efforts on our first concern which is to provide a hot, appetizing, nutritious lunch for children.

Another area of concern to many of us is reimbursement for universal food service. Until such time as there is a national accounting system established for food service, we feel that a more equitable method of reimbursement would be a flat rate paid for each lunch served since cost factors vary greatly from district to district.

We believe one of the most important aspects of universal food service is the assurance that every child has a lunch that will provide one-third of the nutritional requirements for the day available to him, regardless of parental income.

The National Nutrition Education Conference held last November pointed out the growing concern for the lack of good nutrition in the diets of teenagers. Studies and surveys throughout the country have shown that teenage diets from all cultural, social, and economic groups are inadequate and deficient in many of the essential nutrients. Reports also show that this is not due to the lack of good foods, but from improper food choices. This could be corrected with nutrition education.

Sound nutrition education which begins in early childhood enables each individual throughout his life to make wise decisions in his food choices. Research has shown that when individuals are repeatedly given nutritional knowledge, they will establish good, lifetime nutrition practices.

St. Paul is fortunate in having a nutrition resource person on staff and the food service department has both a dietician and a nutritionist. For the last year and a half these people have worked with the local dairy council in presenting inservice training to elementary teachers. These workshops proved the overwhelming lack of training in nutrition and the great need to have this subject added to the curriculum at the college level for teachers.

We believe that the ultimate responsibility for nutrition education in the elementary schools belongs to the classroom teacher. As a result we are attempting to teach teachers to teach nutrition to children.

In order to provide a sequential K–12 nutrition education program as a part of the pilot programs for universal food service, materials at the secondary level would need to be developed. We have found that most programs pertain only to the elementary school and little is available at the secondary level that seems to be relevant to this age group.

A student committee from the 10 high schools in St. Paul has been established to work with the food service department in the areas of (1) improving school lunch, (2) basic nutrition education, (3) means of communication between the food service department and the student population.

In summary we would like to suggest the following:

1. There is an urgent need for universal food service and nutrition education in schools today.

2. Districtwide pilot programs would answer our many questions on the implementation and operation of such a program. The crisis approach to change under which we operate needs to be eliminated and replaced with proper short- and long-term planning. The greatest frustration the food service director has at the local level today is the

lack of time for proper planning due to the length of time required to interpret and process new legislation.

3. We have heard in many instances astronomical figures used to describe needs for equipment and labor to implement the universal food service program. We are not authorities in this, but our experience in installing elementary satellite programs has taught us that you can feed an additional 200 to 500 children from an existing kitchen.

4. For years we have known "that you cannot teach a hungry child." and affluence does not mean an adequate diet, consequently every child should have an opportunity to participate in school feeding programs.

5. Our nutrition training programs for teachers indicate a definite need for nutrition education to be taught as a part of teacher training curriculum. Teachers are obvioulsy the best approach for reaching children with nutrition education.

6. The school food service programs are an integral part of every child's education and should be treated as such. In other fields children are not asked to pay for educational materials. Why should they be asked to pay for their lunch?

7. Good childhood nutrition guarantees stronger and healthier adults who will be better able to solve their own and the world's problems in the coming generations.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Mrs. Ball, welcome to our committee. You did a great job there in St. Paul.

I just want to ask you a couple of questions.

When you say universal food service, do you mean that no cost to any of the students when you use the word "universal"?

Mrs. BALL. At no cost to the students, yes, sir.

Mr. QUIE. What is the cost per meal now?

Mrs. BALL. 54½ cents.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think you will reduce the cost if you went to a universal plan?

Mrs. BALL. Yes, sir; one reason being you will utilize your facilities to far better advantage. We have proved this in putting elementary schools in our satellite programs. We have schools in St. Paul—take Harding High School—in May–June of 1967 they were preparing meals for 924 students I believe. Today they are doing meals for 2,400. We have added one double convention oven and a baker's table, and that is all the equipment we have put in, and they are doing it.

Mr. QUIE. The St. Paul schools, I understand, have some financial difficulties, from what I have been reading. Is that correct?

Mrs. BALL. They lost their bond issue last Tuesday.

Mr. QUIE. And the state law evidently does not affect them favorably?

Mrs. BALL. No, it does not. The other way around.

Mr. QUIE. Now, if the Federal Government was going to provide some substantial additional money, do you think the people would want that to provide free food service to those who could afford to pay for it, or do you think they would like to improve the education in St. Paul and pay for some of the cost of educating the children?

Mrs. BALL. Mr. QUIE, of course, food service is my business. I think every child should have an opportunity to have a hot lunch every day. I do not think it should be based on parental income. I think it

should be a part of the school just the same as you go to an English class or a math class, the same as you participate in an athletic program. This is all part of life.

If these children have this opportunity, it seems to me that we are insuring their ability to learn insofar as possible.

Now, I think it would be idealistic and probably not very realistic to say that every child would participate in the lunch program. I think if we got 85 to 90 percent of the children, this would be good, because you are always going to have menus the children are not going to like. This is a fact of life.

And in St. Paul we provide three choices for all secondary youngsters every day, two hots and a salad bar that meets type A requirements.

Mr. QUIE. My children many times get their lunch in school. Sometimes they don't like the menu, and they bring their own. As you know, the Federal Government pays me well enough so I can afford to feed my children. Why would they learn more in school if they did not have to bring their 55 cents to school each day?

Mrs. BALL. I don't think your children would learn more in school because of this because it would not be a factor in your case.

But how do you go through all of the children in St. Paul and determine who does and who does not? The fact that you have the money does not necessarily mean it is so. You have parents who are working, not at home when their children go to school. The youngsters pack their own lunches. They pack what they want. They decide they don't want to eat that day, they don't bring a lunch. You have the people who are more permissive than others who, if Johnny says, "I don't like that," Johnny does not eat it.

Mr. QUIE. To some extent we have some responsibility for ourselves, for our children, and if you carried this philosophy to its ultimate conclusion, Mrs. Ball—like Mrs. Green was talking about the glasses—there are a number of people who neglect their health. I would say there are more people of wealth that neglect the health of their children than neglect their diet.

I may be wrong, but at least I observe that is being done. You can carry it all the way through, and you end up where the Government could provide better training from birth on, so we might as well begin at 2½ months of age when you can get them weaned and put them under the tutelage of experts, both nutritional experts and development experts and education experts.

Mrs. BALL. I would recognize what you are saying, and yet I could say to you that since we have put the elementary schools in the school lunch programs in St. Paul that we do not have nearly the difficulty feeding the secondary youngsters. It is a part of life. They accept it. At the younger age they have learned to eat the varieties of food that we try to provide. We recognize that the first five times that you would introduce something new that it is not going to be accepted. But it is the same way with going through a line and you have a leader of a group who says, "I like that." The next six kids, even if they hate it, they will like it. It works both ways.

Mr. QUIE. I sometimes wonder if the macaroni manufacturers have some contact with the American School Food Service Association.

Mrs. BALL. This has been a problem child. But I think the younger you can start children learning to like things—I think we need to do more and a better job in introducing foods to children, in having

them taste them, having them presented in such a way that it is not offensive. I think that it is not possible to decide to have Fisherman's salad today without some previous explanation to children of what Fisherman's salad is.

Mr. QUIE. It is my feeling if you can do that, you should do that, even though it is my feeling the children whose parents could pay should. If there was an unlimited amount of Federal money, maybe we would say go ahead and try it, but you know this is very limited. The problems of St. Paul are exactly the same problems the Federal Government has. We are $40 billion in the red this year, and to go to a universal program, the least you could figure would be $2 billion more. The question then becomes should that $2 billion go to pay for the food of people who can afford it themselves or improve the education in many areas where the education is inferior.

I hate to say that about education, because we are proud of the system in this country and we do have an outstanding education system, but it is inferior in some places.

I have visited enough places to know they do not have adequate education.

My own feeling is that $2 billion could be much more wisely spent—again back with the children who cannot afford it—because they tend to have a greater educational disadvantage. It really bothers me that children are going through school, finishing high school, not wanting to go on and do not have a marketable skill. They may have gotten free food, but if they do not have a marketable skill, they have a difficult time no matter how much they know about nutrition.

Mrs. BALL. I agree this is true in almost all aspects of education today; there is not enough money. On the other hand, it would seem to me that if pilot programs could be established—and I certainly would not be one who would advocate a school. I don't see what you learn from a school. I think it should be districtwide. I think you should compile your statistics and prove that this is or is not, and I think that the savings in all of this ticket handling, all this record-keeping—this is tremendous in St. Paul. We have gone to the extent that there is no secondary child in St. Paul that has to ask anyone for a ticket. We mail them to their homes. They just don't have to go to the counselor, the principal. In St. Paul the food service department handles all applications. We do not put this on the school administrator. This is part of our job, and we do it.

Mr. QUIE. I commend you for that, because you remove any onus that might be placed on the student.

Mrs. BALL. But this is expensive. We could provide a lot of lunches for the money we are spending on the administration of this.

Mr. QUIE. Yes, you could. I imagine that would be as much as paying for the free lunches for all of the students who are there.

Mrs. BALL. We could provide a lot of free lunches.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment you on some outstanding testimony in my judgment.

The real issue here is whether it will be a worthwhile project to authorize an expenditure of $5 million for fiscal 1973 and $5 million for 1974 for a universal pilot school lunch program where all the children will participate and receive free meals in the pilot programs, and some of the money will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the universal pilot program.

In your judgment will it be money well spent, and, if so, why?

Mrs. BALL. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment it would be money well spent. We in St. Paul would like to be one of the pilot programs and do whatever amount of work, and we recognize there would be additional work that would have to be done in order to come up with the statistics that would prove or disprove this program.

I think that there is a great need for it. I think nutrition education is something that simply must be started in schools and I think until such time as a program of this kind or another like it is inaugurated, where this is a mandatory part of the education program, that you are never going to get the students to begin their nutrition education at the preschool level.

We have two schools where we have preschoolers involved. We also have a tots program where they start at four, and we are trying now to develop a program for these youngsters in order that they understand why they do what they do. Nutrition education is just like everything else. It is why you do it.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. You have been a great witness, in my judgment.

Chairman PERKINS. Come around, Congressman Vanik.

I did not know you were scheduled to testify, but you proceed. I am delighted to welcome you here. You have been a great leader in the school lunch and breakfast program in this country, and I think we all appreciate your leadership.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you want to make a statement at this time, Miss Martin?

Miss MARTIN. Sir, I would rather hear from Congressman Vanik.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Congressman.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES A. VANIK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. VANIK. Of course I appreciate the time of the committee, and I will endeavor to be brief.

You are to be most highly commended, Mr. Chairman, for your constant efforts to provide better food and nutrition service to all of our Nation's children.

H.R. 13452 is a bill to provide for a program of demonstration projects to test and evaluate the effectiveness, nutritional benefits, administrative procedures, and potential costs of a universal food service and nutrition education program for children.

There are several things that strike me about this proposed 2-year, $10 million pilot program. Under this pilot program, all children in the schools selected for participation will receive at least one nutritious free meal a day. In other words, the mission of the Department of Agriculture and HEW will be to feed children—a mission which one would think that they would be glad to undertake.

This brings me to the point I want to raise. For the past several years, Agriculture has given every indication that it does not really want to feed children—in particular low-income family children, for which existing programs such as school lunch, school breakfast, and the special food services program were specifically designed.

It is a strong charge to say that these agencies do not want to feed hungry children from low-income families, that they do not want to

provide the nutrition and health which is so necessary if we are to provide the type of quality school education referred to by the President in his speech of last Thursday. Yet the evidence supports the charge.

Congress has tried to provide legislation and funding to end hunger. But agency regulations of recent years constantly seem designed to destroy the intent of the Congress in this area. For example, last year's proposed changes in school lunch eligibility requirements were designed to cut the level of assistance by up to 2 million children.

I might say this is not the only area in which we have problems. I am submitting to Congress a report on Internal Revenue laws which we have passed, some of which the administration has elected not to enforce.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that your committee will soon be holding hearings on the administration and adequacy of the entire range of existing low-income feeding programs, and I hope that you will be able to do this in the very near future.

Over the years I have followed the progress of the special food service program—section 13 of the School Lunch Act—with special interest. This program is in a state of immediate crisis—and if the administration of this program is any indication of the Department's commitment or capabilities, I am not sure that they should be entrusted with the administration of new programs.

In December, to determine whether this program was functioning properly, I polled the various State directors of the program, asking whether they had adequate funds to feed the low-income children enrolled in this program during the rest of this school year and to start their summer feeding programs on time.

Mr. Chairman, they do not have adequate funds. Feeding programs for low-income children will be cut in a number of the States beginning April 1.

For example, last Thursday, I received a letter from the State of Maine which said:

> Unless we receive an additional $25,000, we will have to cut both programs and reimbursement for April, May, and June. The USDA has advised us that there are no available funds for fiscal '72.

From the replies which I received from my poll of State directors, Massachusetts and Oklahoma will also begin curtailing programs in the next 2 weeks. Hawaii will begin making cuts in about 4 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, the administration of this program by the Department has been absolutely atrocious.

Officials have assured me that money would be reallocated from States with surplus funds to those with shortages. Apparently that has not happened, and—as I pointed out to the Department—there simply was not enough "surplus" to make up for the shortages most States are facing.

For example, California alone needs an extra $2 million to feed the eligible low-income children enrolled in this program.

The Department has denied that extra funds are needed. Yet the results of my poll reveal a shortage of at least $10 million.

Perhaps the reason the Department can say there is no shortage is that they have discouraged applications or allowed inadequate application periods—a situation which prevailed in your own State of Kentucky, Mr. Chairman. If people are ordered not to apply then obviously there will be no evidence of a shortage.

In addition despite my findings of severe shortages the administration is requesting the same level of funding for section 13 for fiscal year 1973 as it received in fiscal year 1972. Obviously this will allow absolutely no expansion in activities in a growing program, a program which served 107 percent more children in fiscal year 1971 than in fiscal 1970. In fact because of higher costs a steady level of expenditures means that actually fewer children will be served in fiscal 1973.

The startup of this section 13 food program last summer was a fiasco. This year it will probably be a complete disaster.

As you know, funding problems created delays of up to a month in the start of feeding programs last summer.

This year, new Federal Register regulations have been issued which require the submission of summer applications, accompanied by very difficult to obtain demographic and technical information, by April 1—2 weeks from now. Applications received after April 1 will be considered in the order in which they are received. Obviously, many States which are taking money from their summer allotment to maintain school year programs will be unable to estimate their need for the summer for some time yet.

These requirements, coupled with a number of other changes, have led the Children's Foundation and the Food Research and Action Center to conclude that the Department is attempting to inhibit rather than enhance the participation of needy children in the summer feeding program. I would like to include for the record a copy of the criticisms made by the Children's Foundation of the new Federal Register regulations.

I ask unanimous consent.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1972.

Mr. HERBERT D. ROREX,
Director, Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT ROREX: I am writing in response to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (7 CFR Part 225) published in the *Federal Register*, Vol. 37, No. 32 on Wednesday, February 17, 1972.

In general, we are distressed by the shift in the emphasis of the summer feeding programs as proposed. The requirements for service institution participation are clearly designed to cater to the big cities which led the battle for full funding of the Special Feeding Programs last summer.

Our specific comments, objections and recommendations follow below:

Section 225.1: We are pleased that the Special Food Service Program for Children is no longer a "pilot" program.

Section 225.2 (i–1): We recommend that full instructions as to what constitutes an "in kind" contribution be published in the *Federal Register* and not simply in shortened form in the two guide-books (one of which, according to your letter of March 2, 1972, presently is not available.) Non-profit community groups who do not regularly receive FNS Instructions are at a distinct disadvantage because they are forced to add another step to their application process.

Section 225.2 (p–1): The administrative decision to divide the Special Feeding Programs into two different programs: one, year-round non-school food service

and the other, summer food programs, is without statutory authority. While this division may allow for more efficient administration—a laudable move—it has already provided a rationale for withholding funds left over last summer from this fiscal year's year round non-school food programs.

Section 225.7 (a–1): The filing deadline of April 1 is unreasonable for this year in view of the late date of publication of the proposed rule making. Instead we suggest the following wording:

"1) Applications for participation of special summer programs for summer, 1972, which are filed within (6) weeks of the final publication of these amended regulations shall be given first priority.

"2) Applications for participation of summer programs for the following years must be submitted by May 1 of the year. Approval or denial of the application will be made within thirty (30) days or less of the date of filing. Applications received after May 1 shall be reviewed in the order of the date of receipt and shall be approved or denied within thirty (30) days or less of the date of filing."

Section 225.7 (a–1): Delete the proviso that applications shall be considered "to the extent that funds are available for special programs". The size of the federal budget for child nutrition programs has *no bearing whatsoever* on the requirements for participation of local service programs.

Section 225.7 (a–1): Applications filed before the [designated] deadline shall be considered in the following priority: (1) First, applications from service institutions in economically needy areas serving more than a majority of children from low-income families and eligible for free or reduced price meals. (2) Second, applications from service institutions in economically needy areas but serving less than a majority of children eligible for free or reduced price meals. (3) Third, applications from service institutions not located in economically needy areas nor serving a majority of children eligible for free or reduced price meals *but* ones which serve children from low to middle-income families. (4) Applications from service institutions which participated in the program in the prior calendar year.

Section 225.7 (a–1): Delete the following requirement which is irrelevantly and cruelly based on an unknown but, nevertheless, projected federal budget restriction:

"If funds will not permit approval of all applications received prior to April 1, local interest as indicated by the level of local financial support and in-kind contributions shall be considered in determining which applications shall be approved."

The specific focus of this program is on economically needy areas, and yet, outrageously demands that interest in participation be measured by local cash and in-kind contributions.

Section 225.7 (b): The amount of data required to demonstrate that poor economic conditions exist is unreasonably detailed. Only major cities with large bureaucracies could produce such extensive documentation without enormous effort.

This requirement discriminates against small, locally run programs, for example, summer programs conducted by churches or low-income community groups.

Furthermore, the requirement that at least half the mothers in the area be engaged in work outside the home is blatantly sexist and is a misreading of that portion of the statute addressed more specifically to the Breakfast Program.

Section 225.7 (b–1): This requirement that individual applications be submitted for each site serves little use other than to generate additional paper work (which in turn serves to increase the amount of the "in-kind contribution" claimed).

To identify children eligible for free and reduced price meals counters the protection of the anonymity of needy children ensured by the Congress and the laws governing the child nutrition programs. The requirement that service institutions explain the methods they will use to identify needy children is regressive and discriminatory.

We therefore strenuously object to this requirement and suggest that the following wording be deleted: ". . . a description of . . . and the methods to be used to identify children eligible for participation at the site, including the methods to be used to identify those children eligible for free or reduced price meals."

Section 225.7 (c): Competitive bidding for federal contracts should be required no matter how small that contract may be. If an arbitrary number must be

selected we strongly suggest that any operation serving more than 100 children use a competitive bid procedure.

Section 225.10 (e): This section is unclear and ignores the legislative history of Public Law 92-32 and in particular, the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of the Conference. We have the following objections:

1) The term "severe need" used in the Conference Report is unreasonably translated into the requirement that "all or nearly all the attending children are in need of free meals". We suggest, instead, that that line be deleted and that the only requirement be that the State agency or FNSRO judge whether or not the service institution is unable to contribute financially to the program.

2) There is no real difference between the 80 percentum of the operating costs and 100 percentum of the cash expenditure. The conferees pointed out in their report that they *"felt that the Secretary of Agriculture has been unduly restrictive in using the authority to pay up to 80 percent of the operating costs, and it is intended that he will be more liberal in recognizing circumstances of severe need and utilizing the authority to pay all the operating costs in such cases."*

In view of this statement by the conferees we urge the following wording: "in lieu of reimbursement for meals, up to 100 percentum of the cash expenditure for the costs of its food service, *provided, however,* that "such financial assistance shall not exceed 60 cents for a lunch or supper, 20 cents for a breakfast, and 15 cents for supplemental food.

Section 225.18 (a-1): The State Agency or FNSRO should not be responsible for the meal-time schedules of each site operation.

Our conclusion is that these proposed rules serve little else than the interests of the Office of Management and Budget.

We urge you to revise them to serve the needs of hungry children in America.

Bread and justice,

BARBARA BODE, *Vice President.*

Mr. VANIK. In short, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my hope that you can base your judgments on H.R. 13452 upon existing child-feeding programs and the manner in which they have been administered. It is my contention that the administration of presently existing child-feeding programs has been directed toward trying to reduce systematically the number of children to be fed.

In addition, this administration has never, in my judgment, sought to make the funds accessible in a timely fashion or with any degree of ease.

The major question is, will the administration continue to react in this cynical and callous fashion, when the stakes are even greater—as is proposed in H.R. 13452 presently before the committee?

I hope that as you consider H.R. 13452, you will combine it with an effort to improve the existing programs which are so vitally needed.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment you again, Congressman Vanik, on your leadership. I regret that we do not have a majority of the committee here this morning to hear this testimony. But you have always been a great crusader in this area. You have been in the past and will be in the future a tremendous help to this committee.

Let me thank you for coming here this morning and giving us the benefits of your views.

Mr. VANIK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I might ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a letter that I received from your State on this issue.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANIK. I also wanted to submit a letter I had from Minnesota. I thought Mr. Quie might be interested in this.

(The letters referred to follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Frankfort, Ky., January 6, 1972.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: As requested in your letter dated December 20, 1971, the following information is presented:

1. Kentucky's Special Food Service Program for Children (Section 13) allocation for Fiscal Year 1972 is $700,278.

2. Estimated dollar value of all Section 13 applications received to date is:

(*a*) Year-round programs	$435,555.55
(*b*) Summer-only programs	225,961.31
(*c*) Nonfood assistance	10,175.88
Total	671,692.74

3. Number of children being served under existing programs to date:

(*a*) Year-round programs	3,943
(*b*) Summer-only programs	14,865
Total	18,808

4. Number of additional children who could have been included if all applications received had been approved: 1,700.

It seems at this time that Section 13 funds available to Kentucky for Fiscal 1972 are adequate. Had the participation period been longer in several cases, the financial picture would have been different and no doubt additional funds needed. Your assistance and support with respect to Section 13 as well as all other phases of child nutrition are recognized and greatly appreciated. It is commonly known that most individual states as such do not contribute much financial assistance (cash contribution) toward the support of food service programs; therefore, the efforts of Congress and its grants-in-aid are most significant and vital to the continued success of all food service activity.

Sincerely,

C. E. BEVINS,
Director, Division of School Lunch.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., January 7, 1972.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The data you requested concerning the allocation of funds to Minnesota for feeding of low-income children in nonschool situations through the Special Food Service Program is attached.

Representing the needy children of Minnesota, we are deeply grateful to you as author of the Section 13 amendment. This program not only gives direct help to hungry children, but provides fringe benefits in the vocational training of adults in the care of children. In Minnesota, we have used several of the day care centers as laboratories for vocational school training.

We appreciate your help in obtaining sufficient funds not only to maintain, but expand this program. From the data given, you can understand that this fine program will be terminated unless funds are given soon.

Thank you for your concern.

Respectfully,

CHARLES L. MATTHEW,
Director, School Lunch Section.

SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM STATE OF MINNESOTA

1. Allocations:

Yearly program 1971	$343,488
Summer program 1971 [1]	154,779
Total	498,267

Current balance on hand (year around) $125,271.32.

[1] The sum of $202,827.00 was requested but only $154,779.00 was allocated to Minnesota by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. As a result, we still owe the City of St. Paul for their Summer Program $25,197.27; at that, we curtailed many applications received after June, 1971.

2 & 3. Estimated Dollar Value and Number of Meals Served:

	Total served	Reimbursement estimate average rate (cents)	Estimated funding needed
1971–72 fiscal year—round program			
(a) Total lunches	$778,509	37	$288,048
(b) Total suppers	184,980	37	68,443
(c) Total breakfasts	380,172	15	57,026
(d) Total supplements	1,277,632	10	127,763
(e) Total funding needed (sum of a, b, c, and d)			$541,280
1971–72 fiscal year—summer program			
(a) Total lunches	271,772	43	116,862
(b) Total suppers	29,112	43	12,518
(c) Total breakfasts	64,128	15	9,619
(d) Total supplements	276,357	10	27,636
(e) Total fundings (sum of a, b, c, d, and d)			166,635

Note: Total SFSP funding (year round and summer)—$707,915. Estimated expansion of program—20 percent for 1973—$849,498. The total amount we anticipate will be needed for the year round programs is $545,991. The present allocation amounts to $343,388 leaving a balance of $202,503 to pay the balance of the claims for the fiscal year 1971–72. Figures unavailable for nonfood assistance.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you want to make a statement at the present time, Miss Martin?

Miss MARTIN. I would like to make a statement at some appropriate time.

Chairman PERKINS. Why don't you commence now?

STATEMENT OF JOSEPHINE MARTIN, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Miss MARTIN. My name is Josephine Martin. I am administrator of the school food service program, Georgia Department of Education. I am chairman of the American School Food Service Association's legislative committee.

It is a pleasure for me to be testifying in support of H.R. 13452, a bill to test the concept of universal school food service and nutrition education.

The pilot programs would provide answers to some of the questions you are asking today—questions that we do not have answers for.

In 1969, the American School Food Service Association adopted a blueprint for action, and that blueprint contained the concepts embodied in H.R. 5291, a bill to establish universal school food service and nutrition education.

Since the program started in 1946, the Federal Government has been subsidizing all lunches served—to rich and poor. The level of subsidy varies with socioeconomic level of parents.

Another question to be demonstrated with the pilot program is that food service is basic to the child's well-being. It is not a "frill" or "option." It should not be considered as "athletic," where children pay for tickets to the ballgame.

In behalf of the 49,000 members of American School Food Service Association, I express appreciation to Congressman Perkins, and the members of this committee for leadership in advancing child nutrition programs through more adequate funding and legislation.

Since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which made funds available in several States for school lunches for disadvantaged children, the relationship between hunger in the classroom and the education of the disadvantaged children has been recognized.

Furthermore, studies reveal that malnutrition and undernutrition exist among all socioeconomic groups and that hunger and learning are related irregardless of the cause of hunger.

The ESEA (title I) demonstration, Public Law 91-248 passed in 1970, and Public Law 92-153 passed in 1971, have made possible for schools to increase the number of economically needy children having lunches from 2.9 million in 1968 to 8.1 million in 1971 (November).

Lunches are available to 44.8 million children daily and yet only 25.4 million children have lunches. I have been advised that the number of paying children has declined drastically in the past few years. Fewer paying children are eating now. Increase in sale price means fewer paying children.

The goal of H.R. 5291 is to provide at least one meal each day to all children as an integral part of the educational process; to incorporate nutrition education into the school food service program; to provide funds to local systems to assist with professional staffing. The goal is to provide universal food service by 1975. The statistics cited above reveal in a startling manner the magnitude of the task.

The growth of school food service since 1968 has been phenomenal, but the growth has basically been along the lines of school food service systems as they have evolved over the past 25 years. If the school food service practitioner and the educator are to be in a position to implement the universal program in 1975 which will not only require expansion in existing schools, but expansion into buildings without facilities, we must begin now to build pilot programs to test procedures and techniques to devise strategies and to build models in all types of schools and districts throughout the United States to serve as guides for the program.

We must find answers to questions being asked by proponents of universal school food service as well as by the opponents. There are plaguing questions related to universal school food service that have not been answered, because they have not been posed.

Many schools in Georgia are serving all children daily, but none are serving all children under the concepts of H.R. 5291—universal school food service and nutrition education. So new questions will be posed in test situations, and answers will be found, questions relating to quality service to pupils, effective nutrition education; administrative procedures, quality control, and cost effectiveness.

In June 1971 when the General Subcommittee on Education held hearings on H.R. 5291, Congressman Pucinski stated:

> I hope Congress will give nutritionists a decade in which to prove their worth; to prove the vital relationship between food and health, food and learning, food and productivity.

The Congressman added that the cost of universal school food service would force nutritionists to be effective, or the taxpayers would not support the program.

As our objectives are focused on providing a lunch for every child, we simultaneously realize that it is not enough just to provide a meal. Dr. Bruno Bettleheim, eminent psychologist, University of Chicago, states "how one is fed, and how one eats, has a larger impact on the personality than any other human experience."

A statement such as this makes us wonder how we can provide meals to all children in such a way that the lunch has a positive impact on the child's personality development.

Another noted psychologist-educator, Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, recently wrote that special emphasis should be placed in the curriculum for the disadvantaged child in two areas: (1) The study of nutrition at grades three or four and eight or nine; (2) opportunities to meet self-image needs of the child.

It appears then that universal school food service and nutrition education offers opportunities for helping to fulfill both these curriculum needs. The question is, how?

The answer will come through pilot programs. Other questions which must be answered if the goal of universal school food service and nutrition education is reached include the following:

1. How will the Nation mobilize its resources to get meals in all schools? What are the effective delivery systems available under varying conditions?

2. How will the program planners devise sound school nutrition programs that have relevance for young people? One that considers ethnic and cultural backgrounds, varying nutritional needs, developmental needs of youth in accordance with physical, emotional, and social growth.

3. How do the program planners build quality and cost control into the program? We must build a model to demonstrate to the taxpayer the integrity of the program, and the quality and cost controls expected in a universal program.

4. What is an effective nutrition education program—one that results in improved food selection by the child both in and out of school? We have very few models to emulate.

5. How much and what kind of staff is needed to fully implement H.R. 5291 at the school, school district, and State level. Personnel will be the key to program success. At this point, there are no national staffing standards, or job specifications for food service professionals.

6. What are the organizational structures most conducive to effective programs at the local, State, and Federal level? What are the administrative costs.

7. What are the constraints or barriers to effective implementation?

8. How much will the program cost? How much should the program cost?

At the risk of being repetitive, I again congratulate you and thank you for introducing H.R. 13452, a bill to establish pilot programs in

universal school food service and nutrition education in centers across the State.

The bill, if passed, will provide opportunities to get answers or direction to the questions listed above.

As the school food service administrator in a State where 84.5 percent of all children have school lunch daily; a State that has full support of school administrators for food service, I'm very cognizant of the growth problems encountered in expanding programs.

Some problems are alleviated with time under the present structures; other problems seemingly will be omnipresent. For example, let us look at a problem that exists in the program as it is operated today. Assuming that all children have lunch with some paying, and others not paying.

How can we protect the anonymity of the nonpaying child? Under the very best conditions, the child himself knows that he is getting a lunch at no cost or a different cost because he is poor. What does this do to his self-concept? In this case, it it possible that lunch does as much harm as good?

How can we protect the needs of the child who refuses to purchase or accept a lunch because of pride, or because of his felt needs in relation to his money?

How can we reduce administrative procedures to simplify school food service operations? Schools are required to keep daily records of meals served by paid, free, reduced lunches; white, black, Spanish-surnamed, American Indian children. Applications and announcements are sent home each year—in many instances to parents who can't read, in some instances to homes without parents. Administrators are seeking answers to these questions.

As a member of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition, I am pleased that H.R. 13452 utilizes that group to consult and assist in planning and evaluating the pilot programs. The council recently made its first annual report to President Nixon.

The top priority recommendations related to expanding food service into all schools, and developing effective nutrition education programs. I believe the National Advisory Council will be effective in helping to evaluate the results of the pilot programs. However, the group will need technical advice from specialists in evaluation, management, nutrition, and child psychology.

To implement universal school food service and nutrition education, funds are needed for local administrative costs as well as State and Federal costs. Therefore, I trust that section 810(e) will be amended to include (4) local administration expenses.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today in support of H.R. 13452. I sincerely hope that the bill will receive immediate consideration by the Congress in order that the pilot centers can gear up to start the test in September.

School Food Service has finally earned for itself a place at the education table. Such an honor carries commensurate responsibilities. The pilot programs will provide essential program planning, testing, revising, and retesting of techniques, strategies, and contents to make the universal school food service and nutrition education meaningful to the lives of all young people in America as it contributes to their health and well-being.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Martin, I recall you came before the committee several years ago when we were trying to improve the school lunch program for the needy and we did improve that program I just want to compliment you on the great leadership that you have given to implement the program to provide nutritious meals to needy students in elementary and secondary schools.

Your contributions have been tremendous. I certainly hope we can move the pilot program without too much difficulty.

You have been most helpful to the committee and again, let me thank you.

Our next witness is Mr. B. P. Taylor, superintendent of schools, San Diego Independent School District, San Diego, Tex. Come around.

We are anxious to hear from you, Mr. Taylor. Without objection, your prepared statement will be inserted in the record and you can summarize your statement in any way you prefer.

STATEMENT OF BYRAN P. TAYLOR, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, SAN DIEGO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN DIEGO, TEX.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you. I would like to start out with a brief written statement and then I will answer any questions you may have about the program. As I started, my name is Bryan P. Taylor. I am superintendent of San Diego Independent School District in San Diego, Tex. I have been superintendent in San Diego for some 13 years. San Diego is located in deep southwest Texas. Our school district consists of some 400 square miles: 1,700 students of which some 99 percent are of Latin American descent.

We are a poor school district from the standpoint of taxable property. Some 60 to 70 percent of the students come from families that have income of less than the poverty guidelines and, consequently will qualify under the guidelines set forth by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The students of course, qualify for free meals.

We have been participating in the national school lunch program for many years and I think the records will show that we have gladly participated in this program knowling full well that it is a good one.

When it was possible to serve breakfast under this program we were among the first to serve, not just a breakfast consisting of dry cereal, toast, and milk, but a breakfast consisting of bacon, eggs, hot cereal, homemade bread, fruit juice, and milk.

For the past 18 months we have been serving three meals a day to our children. I think that we are probably the only school district in the Nation doing this.

I have been in favor of universal feeding for public school children for many years. We at San Diego Independent School District have been in reality practicing this for the past 4 or 5 years since above 90 percent of our students eat at the cafeteria.

The public school cafeteria is a perfect meeting place for the rich and the poor, the black and the white. The public school cafeteria is a place where the academic talented may converse with the lower academic achiever. The 210-pound football player may converse with the 100-pound victim of cerebral palsy. This is really what education is all about. Out of our program have come some significant statistics such as: (1) our attendance has been better since our feeding program started; we consistently have over 95 percent attendance, (2) we have

very few discipline problems, (3) the students have improved in their grades, (4) our dropout rate is practically nothing, and (5) our children are much healthier according to a national health survey.

We have found that the school cafeteria is the one place where all students may receive equal treatment. There are some byproducts of a program like this. For instance, our football and basketball teams have for the past few years been much better then they were prior to this program. The students themselves seem to understand each other's problems a whole lot better. We find that very few students and almost none of the teachers leave the campus during the noon hour.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me make this observation. You are making a great statement, Superintendent Taylor, but the entire statement has already been inserted in the record. Tell us briefly, in response to my question, why we need the universal pilot program.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think you need the universal pilot program for one reason, that a lot of people are not convinced that this is the right thing to do. That rich kids should be given free meals along with poor kids, that they should associate together completely through the school day.

I think we have to show the public this. I think this is the intent to the bill, to show the people that a universal lunch program is good for public schools and students and people alike. I think the great thing that it will do is keep the majority of all the students on the campus during the day. And I think this is where our public schools have a tremendous problem today, keeping kids on the campus and under supervision.

Chairman PERKINS. That is a point that has not been made. You make that statement because there would be no necessity for them to leave or have excuses to go and get lunch and therefore they would be on the campus all day long.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Or on the school grounds all day long.

Mr. TAYLOR. Under supervision.

Chairman PERKINS. That will eliminate a lot of other problems that go along with leaving the school grounds, and going out in the community and town and elsewhere under the pretense of getting lunches.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, this is a basic reason. One of the underlying basic factors we went to the third meal. We keep the student on the campus from the time school is out until 5:30 or 6. We think this is what public schools were made for.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you find that there are numerous children who are able to buy their lunch, but whose parents neglect to see that they have money and so they don't eat lunch at all; in other words, the fail to eat lunch, even though they can well afford it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think they fail to get lunch and I think, too, they will take the money that their parents give them and not particularly buy food with it. They might buy cigarettes or something more harmful with this money.

Where today under the universal lunch program, there is no need of giving them any money at all. There is no need of them having money at school when the lunch is there available for them.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Superintendent Taylor.

Our next witness is Mrs. Adelaide Neily, Fairfax County, Va., public schools.

We are delighted to welcome you here this morning, Mrs. Neily, please proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF ADELAIDE NEILY, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA., PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mrs. NEILY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being asked or permitted to express my views in regard to H.R. 13452. We are very conscious that our objectives have been very hard to meet in local school districts because of increased costs of food supplies, equipment and labor, and a reduced or curtailed funding of our program which has necessitated increasing the price of lunches to children in our localities.

In previous years, when we had a lunch price at 25¢, the county average was 63.2, but to be able to balance the budget we have had to increase the price of our meals. Therefore, our participation has dropped to 54 percent.

Chairman PERKINS. Dropped from what percent?

Mrs. NEILY. From 63.2 down to 54. It has taken us all these years and we have never recovered.

Chairman PERKINS. What was your price of your school lunch when you had reached the maximum of 63 percent of your students?

Mrs. NEILY. Twenty-five cents in elementary schools and 30 cents in the intermediate and high school or junior high level.

Chairman PERKINS. What is it today at the junior high level?

Mrs. NEILY. Forty-five cents and 35 cents at the elementary.

Chairman PERKINS. That does not include a drink or milk or anything along that line, does it?

Mrs. NEILY. Yes; it does include milk with their lunch and desert every day.

Chairman PERKINS. And you are serving a lunch in Fairfax County at 45 cents?

Mrs. NEILY. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. And at the 45-cent price you have dropped from 64 percent participation down to 53?

Mrs. NEILY. Yes. We have defeated our purpose because we are not feeding as many children. The only thing we have accomplished is balancing the budget.

I discussed this problem with the director of food service in Montgomery County because they are trying a unique study right now. They have reduced the price of their meals in six schools. They have gone from 50 cents to 35 cents in the elementary level and from 55 cents at junior high schools to 35 cents. This has been going on since January 3.

If you will note on page 2, in this brief time they have already increased participation. When I look at the five high school divisions in Virginia with participation of 89.7 to the lowest at 85.5, these school divisions have lunches at 25 and 30 cents.

Bill H.R. 13452 provides the opportunity to provide meals to all children and to obtain reliable data in regards to the participation. It provides an opportunity to reach all children without financial stigma.

In spite of all the effort and expense of devising means of protecting the child who is eligible for a free or reduced price meal it has been more or less a dismal failure, in particular at the intermediate and secondary level.

Most school districts provide meal tickets for the child who is eligible. One finds at the intermediate and secondary level that the student who has a ticket is rather conspicuous. It is not uncommon for a teenager to refuse to accept a meal ticket when clearly eligible.

At the same time studies reveal dietary deficiencies among this age.

H.R. 13452 would provide an opportunity to begin nutrition education with the very young child. Unless we can establish desirable dietary patterns in the young, unless we can assist children in accepting a wide variety of foods, unless we can provide him with correct information to differentiate between what is good and proper food as advertised in the mass media, unless we can teach the reason and need for accepting food on arising in the morning before he begins his school day or his play day—we have failed our youth. Local supervisors of food service commend you for providing for nutrition education for children in this bill.

Bill H.R. 13452 will challenge educators to make nutrition information more interesting, more dynamic—for students like many adults are not motivated by an interest in nutrition per se—they want the things good nutritional habits can assist them in attaining. There will be involvement of team teaching to incorporate nutrition in many subject fields.

Student involvement will be a must to have effective change in youth's dietary habits. No longer, and rightly so, can youth be told what to eat because it is good—nutrition teaching must be centered upon his needs.

Briefly, I believe bill H.R. 13452 provides an opportunity to study and evaluate the effectiveness and problems involved in universal school feeding and nutrition education for all children before increased expansion and expenditures are made. It will provide nutrition awareness at all levels, pupil, teacher, parent-community; it will provide for the elimination of financial stigma attached to eating, and place the child on the same level with all his classmates; it will provide for reduction of school administration time spent in determining who is needy, it will provide for reduced expenditures of labor at all levels spent on compiling, computing of financial accountability records; it will provide for an opportunity to truly eliminate hunger among children of our nation; it will provide for an establishment of values in the educational field by making all facets of the educational program equally available to all children without revealing family income or family size; and it will provide an incentive to local school personnel who have endeavored and struggled to assist with improving dietary habits of children to put forth greater effort because we are supported by the interest of the Congress of the United States.

Thank you very much for permitting me to express my views.

Chairman PERKINS. Just tell us in a few sentences why you feel Fairfax County students in both elementary and secondary schools should enjoy the benefit of the free school lunch?

Mrs. NEILY. I am from the so-called affluent county. Yet we have over 5,000 students who are eligible for free or reduced price meals. We have many parents who cannot read or write. I feel from our

studies of the breakfast program we have found that the affluent have very poor eating habits. We find children coming to school with dollars, not 45 cents, who have spent a portion of that money before they have gotten to school on soft drinks, cigarettes, et cetera.

I feel we would be doing the citizens of our county a great service in combining nutrition education with proper food for their children.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. You have made a very wonderful statement and I appreciate the fact that you came over to give us the benefit of your views.

So far as I know, this concludes the testimony this morning. This may conclude the testimony on the pilot bill H.R. 13452 unless I decide to call a few more witnesses, but I think the bill is so simple in purpose that we are either for the proposal or we are against it.

It would be my viewpoint that we should bring it before the full committee for a markup at the earliest possible date. I am hopeful that we may get to it at the regular meeting.

Unless there is somebody else in the room that wants to give his views on the legislation, the committee will adjourn subject to call of the Chair.

Thank all of you for your attendance and your appearance here this morning. You have been most helpful to the committee.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the committee adjourned, to reconvene subject to call of the Chair.)

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL NURSES,
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
March 20, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: As Legislative Council Representative from California to the Department of School Nurses, National Education Association, on behalf of approximately 2000 school nurses in California, I would like to express support for H.R. 13452—Nutrition Program for Children.

School Nurses have long realized the influence of nutrition on the ability to learn. Under-nutrition and mal-nutrition reduce concentration, lessen the attention span, and cause excess fatigue; plus the added factor of poor physical and mental growth. The Maintenance of nutritional well-being is a needed role for schools to play. The school program cannot meet these needs by providing lunches only, but must incorporate nutrition education in the curriculum. Your interest is greatly appreciated by all school nurses who see these needs daily.

Food Service and Nutritional Education Programs for all children must be considered. The Department of School Nurses-National Education Association strongly support all moves in this direction.

Sincerely,

REGINA M. EDDY, R.N., B.Sc.,
Legislative Council Representative.

THE AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 4, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Dietetic Association is pleased to present a statement in support of H.R. 13452, a bill to provide a program that will test and evaluate a universal food service and nutrition education program for children.

The American Dietetic Association represents 25,000 dietitians whose objectives are: the improvement of nutrition of human beings and the advancement of the science of dietetics and nutrition as well as education in these and allied areas.

This is the third opportunity which we have had to express our viewpoint to Congress concerning the school food service programs. In 1969, The American Dietetic Association presented testimony in support of legislation to guarantee a lunch to needy children at a free or reduced price. Early in June of last year our representative testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation in support of S. 1919 and H.R. 5257, bills to make the school breakfast permanent. Later in June of 1971, we testified before your committee concerning H.R. 5291, the Child Nutrition Act of 1971.

In this latter testimony we stated, "Our Association is convinced that at least one meal that supplies at least one-third of a child's daily nutritional requirements should be furnished *every* school child." Our position has not changed. Therefore, we support the provisions of H.R. 13452 which will allow the establishment of programs to test the feasibility of the concept of universal school lunch.

In previous testimony we have expressed concern that there be nutrition education programs correlated with every child feeding program. We believe that hungry children must be fed but we insist that there be applied nutrition taught in conjunction with each program if the basic purpose of such programs, the development of citizens with an awareness of the principles of sound nutritional practices, is to be achieved. We are most pleased that in H.R. 13452 there is provision for a nutrition education program in schools selected for participation in the demonstration projects.

On March 7, 1972, the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition in its first annual report to President Nixon recommended that much greater emphasis be put on teaching children the essentials of good nutrition. The report said that the teaching of nutrition "has become a forgotten part of the curriculum with teachers reluctant to include it is their instruction due in many instances to their own lack of training in nutrition and to the press of other curriculum subjects."

Following a meeting of this National Advisory Council with the President on March 7, the Secretary of Agriculture said that the Administration would support the recommendations of the Council.

We recommend, therefore, that the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition assume an active role not only in "evaluating the results of the program as authorized by this section" (Section 14 of Public Law 92-248), but that they or their approved representatives be active in the development of the related nutrition education program *before* and *during* the demonstration projects as provided for in H.R. 13452.

We recommend further that in those sites selected for the pilot programs there be established local advisory councils to monitor the progress of the programs. This should be of invaluable assistance in establishing programs suited to "varying ethnic and racial enrollments" as stated in H.R. 13452.

The provisions of H.R. 13452 should be instrumental in testing and developing new methods of food service delivery, research that is certainly necessary if the concept of universal school food service is to be realized. We recommend that in the establishment and supervision of the test programs a qualified dietitian be employed by the administrative body.

Until such time that there is sufficient evidence to refute the objection that universal school lunch is too costly and unfeasible to administer, our conviction that this is sound nutritional practice will not be realized. Demonstration projects as outlined in the provisions of H.R. 13452 will be of great assistance in collecting the required data.

I would appreciate it if this letter could be made a part of the printed record of hearings.

Sincerely,

KATHARINE E. MANCHESTER, R.D.
President.